



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

care for men, or women, or children? Victory must be won, even if in the last extremity, every vestige of the enemy — his person, his rights and his property — has to be swept away. It has always been so with war; it always will be so. It is just as impossible for civilized nations to wage civilized warfare as it is for savages. All war is savagery, the civilized nations themselves being the last and chief witnesses.

Appeal for Contributions.

At the opening of the new century the American Peace Society finds its work of such increased importance and promise that it feels itself justified, not only in asking its friends for their usual annual contributions, but in laying before them the urgent need of much larger funds for its further and more efficient development.

The successful establishment of the Permanent International Court of arbitration, for which the society has worked steadily and earnestly for more than sixty years, gives the cause of international peace a standing in public appreciation and confidence such as it has never known before. This indicates also the direction in which future practical peace efforts may be most wisely put forth. General public confidence in the court must be created. The governments must be induced to have regular recourse to it in the settlement of their controversies. They must be led to make special treaties between them to this end. The nations not represented at The Hague must be brought in some way into the enjoyment of the benefits of the court. Here is a wide, important and urgent field of work for many years to come.

General interest in the cause of international peace needs to be greatly widened and deepened everywhere. The spirit of international aggression and injustice, still so strong and ruinous, must be broken down. Love, trust and fellowship between races and nations are still deplorably weak, and need endless encouragement and strengthening. Old grudges and causes of misunderstanding remain to be removed. The evil effects of recent events will entail an incalculable amount of labor in their eradication.

In all these directions the society desires to be able to meet efficiently its increased opportunities and responsibilities. The coming summer it expects to be represented at the Tenth International Peace Congress to be held at Glasgow, Scotland, during the Exposition, and it hopes also to have a representative in the City of Mexico at the time of the Pan-American Conference, which has been arranged for by Secretary of State Hay.

Liberal contributions for the immediate needs of the work are earnestly solicited, and our friends are kindly invited to bear in mind, in the final distribution of their property by will, the American Peace Society, and the unsurpassed interests of the cause for which it labors.

Editorial Notes.

In an article on "Society's Defense Against the Criminal," in the January number of the *Albany Law Journal*, Hon. Gino C. Speranza of the New York Bar speaks as follows of the relation of war to criminality:

"Nor must it be forgotten, especially at this period of our country's history, that war always means an increase in criminality; especially is this true of wars of conquest or against a greatly inferior enemy. War, no matter how glorified, is the negation of the principles of justice and reason and the assertion that might makes right. The opportunities which it offers for the exercise of heroic qualities cannot compensate for the evil influence which it exerts on those among us who need but a slight stimulus to break the restraints of law and order. That war, in its train of horrors, carries also an impulse to greater wrong doing and non-observance of law, is not a mere supposititious statement, but an undeniable fact. While it is true that during the actual continuance of hostilities crimes against the person are often on the decrease (because men of violence join the ranks of legalized violence called the 'army') after the cessation of hostilities there is always observable a marked increase in the number of offenses of all kinds. This is not surprising if we remember that, besides its demoralizing influence, war also means a diminished interest in the administration of justice and in the enforcement of laws, and a weakening of the defensive strength of the state against its internal foes.

"When we bear in mind that during war periods the ratio between the births of males and females is disturbed by a perceptible increase in the number of males, we can begin to appreciate how far-reaching must be the influence of the war spirit on all social conditions; how, if it affects even the process of physiological forces, it must, *a fortiori*, affect the products of social and psychic causes such as crimes."

During the debate in the House on the army appropriation bill, Representative McClellan of New York made a comparison of the war budgets of the United States, Austria, France, Germany, Italy and Russia. The statistics which he brought forward showed that the total annual cost of army and navy in Austria is, in round numbers, *seventy-four* millions of dollars, of France *one hundred and ninety* millions, of Germany *one hundred and eighty-eight* millions, of Italy *sixty-two* millions, of Russia *one hundred and forty-eight* millions, of the United States, at the present time, *two hundred and thirty-three* millions. The per capita cost for each is: Austria one dollar and sixty-six cents, France four dollars and ninety-two cents, Germany three dollars and sixty cents, Italy one dollar and ninety-seven, Russia one dollar and fourteen cents, the United States three dollars and three cents. Our annual war budget, therefore, exceeds by

forty-three millions, that of France, the highest of those with which he made comparison. France and Germany still pay more per capita than the United States. If, however, our pension budget be put in, our per capita expenditure is raised to five dollars and six cents, which is fourteen cents more than that of Germany, the highest taxed of the European nations. Our present total annual war budget, including pensions of which the European nations know nothing, is, in round numbers, *three hundred and eighty-seven* millions, or more than twice that of France. The cost per soldier in Europe is highest in Germany, namely, *two hundred and seventy-eight* dollars. In the United States it is *fifteen hundred* dollars. This is about three times the average annual income of the families of the United States. The total of our army and navy budget is more than half of our entire annual governmental expenditure. Mr. McClellan did not bring into the comparison Great Britain, whose war and navy budget is now more than two hundred and fifty million dollars, or twenty millions more than that of our country. It is a curious comment on the character of these two Anglo-Saxon nations, which have recently shouted their throats sore boasting of their high Christian civilization, that in matter of expenditure they have already become the foremost war powers of the world. Ten years ago their lips were perpetually full of condemnation of the folly and madness of the European powers. There will be something further to chronicle as time goes on.

**War Looting
at Home.**

In a recent letter to the Boston *Transcript*, Dr. W. F. Crafts of Washington lays bare facts in regard to the present militaristic raiding of the national treasury which ought to arouse the moral indignation and condemnation of every citizen in the land. He writes:

"It is against the madness of our militarism as a whole that I wish to protest, and to urge all good citizens to protest. Our war tax this year, for army, navy and pensions, will reach five dollars per capita, twenty-five dollars per family. Before the war with Spain I showed in the *Outlook* that the per capita American war tax, including army and navy and pensions, was equalled only in Russia. It is now at least twice as large as Russia's. Imagine a collector calling at every home in the land and demanding twenty-five dollars from each family for a permanent regular army and 'big navy,' and to pension, not alone or chiefly those disabled in the service of their country and having no other means of support,—cases against which no one complains,—but divorced widows, camp followers, senators, congressmen, judges, clerks, many of them drawing one, and some of them two other incomes from the government. The direct collection of such a tax would bring on a new civil war that would revise our war budget in a hurry. But because the tax, most of which will continue when the Philippine war is over, as our annual burden, is collected indirectly by making us pay more for everything

we buy, the people, busy with money-making and amusement, seem unconscious that this war looting is going on in every house.

"Armies, whether in peace or war, always foster six great evils, already of appalling strength in this country. They increase intemperance, impurity, Sabbath breaking, gambling and lessen the sacredness of life and property. The recent speeches of Senator Lodge as to saloons in the Philippines and the admissions of the Taft Commission that the state regulation of vice is there for the first time officially undertaken under our flag, with the West Point revelations and the looting in China, are fresh illustrations of what militarism means. It is not so much the blood and broken bones as the vice and ruined characters that make every true man who knows real war repeat General Sherman's words in capitals, 'WAR IS HELL!' The churches are not saying much about a future hell just now, and it would seem that they might use some of that side-tracked energy on this hell of war which has recently 'enlarged herself.'

"This militarism in Washington, which looks to some good people afar off like patriotism, is really three-fourths patronage. One of the officers of the House of Representatives said to me, by way of explanation, when the former army bill was up: 'The party in power has to have a lot of offices to give away. This will make thousands of offices for young men in nice families all over the country.' The tame submission of the Democrats to the present army bill was attributed by a senator in open Senate to the patronage they would get, which is usually one-third, as against two-thirds for the Republicans."

In a speech in the House of Commons in December, when the government asked for a credit of \$80,000,000, to enable them to further prosecute the war in South Africa, William Randal Cremer, in a speech of protest, showed that it was not true that the nation had really endorsed the government's policy. Here is what he said:

"Her Majesty's government have thought it advisable to ask this House to vote £16,000,000 to enable them to carry on the war in South Africa. As probably not more than a handful of members will consider it their solemn duty to vote against the grant, I think it is advisable that at least one of them should state his reasons for going into the lobby against the motion. I have always regarded this war as not only unjust, but unnecessary—a war which might easily have been avoided if there had been a disposition on the part of the government to avoid it. It is said that Her Majesty's government are no longer responsible for the war; that the nation, by its verdict, has endorsed the policy and the action of the government, and that it is now a national war. I wish to try and dispel that illusion by quoting figures to show that our countrymen have not by their votes endorsed the war; that, indeed, they had no opportunity of doing so. I take the last census. It is true that it is nine years old, but probably my case would be strengthened if we had the figures up to date. According to that census there were 8,141,152 male adults in the United Kingdom. The total on the register of parliamentary voters on Jan. 1, 1900, was 6,600,283.

The total number of votes recorded at the recent election was 5,034,010. If we analyze these figures we shall find that the number of those who voted Tory, and by so doing endorsed the war, was 2,578,492. But that leaves 5,562,652 male adults who either had no votes to record or were practically disfranchised by the election being fought on a stale register, or voted against the government. . . . It has been stated over and over again that the recent verdict was a national verdict. I deny that the small minority of the nation to whom I have alluded justifies such a statement, and I am trying to assign that as a reason for my opposition to this vote. . . . I, for one, shall have no hesitation in voting against this motion, whether there be one, or a dozen, or twenty with me. I remember what took place during the war in the Crimea. There was then the same difficulty in expressing one's earnest convictions against the war as there has been in reference to the present struggle. But I console myself with the reflection that the verdict of history is always with the friends of peace. There is not a man to be found in this House who will now declare that the Crimean war was a just one, or one that could not have been easily avoided. I am perfectly certain that a rude awakening will come with regard to the South African war, and that before many years have passed we shall have the same kind of feeling expressed by the masses of the people, who have been purposely deluded in regard to the objects of the war, as was expressed after the war in the Crimea, and that it will be difficult to find a man who will stand up and justify the course which has been pursued in South Africa."

Lord Roberts' Savage Orders.

As the things done under Lord Roberts' orders in South Africa come more and more to light, one wonders how a single Englishman can hold up his head and look the world straight in the face. We have little heart to detail them in our columns. The reports of them, which have finally gotten into the papers,—reports to which the believers in war habitually shut their eyes,—make a Christian heart exceeding sorrowful. And for these horrible and mournful doings there are still parades and receptions and eulogies and earldoms in countries calling themselves Christian! Lord Roberts, we are told, must not be blamed; he is only the tool of the nation, of the government. But why is a man who deliberately and cheerfully makes himself the tool of a government and demands a free hand in the commission of such atrocities to be freed from blame? Lord Roberts has shown that he is willingly and of his own motion an expert in these cruelties. General Roberts, as he was then, commanded the troops during the Afghan war. He was then "denounced by every humane and righteous person in the country for the devastation which the troops under his command committed." In January, 1880, at a meeting convened by the Birmingham Liberal Association on the anniversary of the battle of Isandula, John Bright uttered these historic words in regard to these devastations:

"To-day is the anniversary of the battle of Isandula. Sad day! Can any one show us the justification for the

action we then took, or the compensation we have received for the enormous and incalculable loss of life in that one day's war? Well, in Afghanistan, a country as large as France and as mountainous as Switzerland, our troops are engaged in slaughtering and hanging the natives of the villages, and women and children are turned out into the frost and snow of this inclement season; and this is done at the command of a government professing to be wiser and more Christian and more humane than those with whom our troops are contending. I say, let us abandon our pretensions, let us claim no longer to be Christian, let us go back to the heathen practices. I say, take down, at any rate, the Ten Commandments inside your churches, and say no longer you believe in or read the Sermon on the Mount. Abandon your Christian pretensions or else your savage and heathen practices."

In a letter written in 1849, Frederick W. Robertson, the famous Brighton preacher, thus speaks of the way in which war was carried on by the British in South Africa:

"I have just this moment returned from dining with Captain H—— and hearing a long account of Kaffirland and incidents of Cape warfare. On the whole, they are very horrible, and make war more a matter of shambles than it appears in books. The Kaffirs torture all their prisoners. Our officers were tied up to trees and the young Kaffirs practiced at them with the assagai, the mothers looking on and clapping their hands at a good shot. Some were flayed alive, others burnt with hot sticks; then there is a bullock goad, a specimen of which he showed me, a favorite instrument of torture. Horrible as all this is, Captain H—— said that they are not so ferocious as our English soldiers. A Kaffir one day pointed to one of our men in a state of intoxication, and then significantly to himself said: 'You would make us like that!'

"They treat our women, too, with delicate respect, which our men never imitate. Captain H—— has seen a soldier deliberately place his musket to a woman's breast, that he might kill both herself and the child at her back with the same shot. The English officer, a subaltern, took no notice of this barbarity, and H—— was obliged to put him under arrest. Indeed, it seems that officers and men become brutalized there. He mentioned one colonel at whom a Kaffir fired and singed his face. The colonel knocked the Kaffir down, strode over him, and coolly took out his knife and jagged it across his throat, instead of stabbing or shooting him. From his account I confess I felt strongly on the side of the Kaffirs. They feel that they will become as degraded as Hottentots by being subject to the English. At present they do not drink, and have a much finer sense of honor than the brutal soldier.

"For a long time it was a mystery where the Kaffirs got their arms and ammunition. At last, when the war was ended, the secret came out. Every captured musket had the Tower of London stamped on it; that is, the condemned muskets, which are bought up by merchants, had been shipped off to the Cape and sold to the savages. Nor did they ever want powder. Steamers were fitted out by dealers at the Cape and

sent up the shore with ammunition. Can you conceive selfishness and treason of darker turpitude than this? And the Kaffirs afterwards said, in Shylock's vein, 'These be your Christian merchants!'"

War Kills the Human Soul. Writing from South Africa at the end of September last, Olive Schreiner gives such a picture of the terrible moral degradation produced by war as almost drives one to madness:

"No man knows really what war is who is not brought face to face with it as we are. The battles on the battlefields, the wounded dying alone, choked with blood and dust, the vultures flying over for their feasts, — these are not pleasant things, but the actual physical suffering and horror of the battlefield, including that of the horses, is as absolutely nothing compared to the awful moral effect of war. It turns men and women into brutes; it returns society to the savage and the wild animal stage. When one reads of the French Revolution, of women sitting to knit while the heads rolled off, one accepted it as a fact because there was too much testimony to doubt it; but one did not realize it or understand how it could happen. Now I know; it is perfectly easy to understand. Being surrounded with continual bloodshed and slaughter kills the human soul, and leaves only the brute beast alive in all but rare and strong souls. If I had been told a year ago of all the horrors that have taken place in South Africa during the last six months under martial law, the burning of houses, the driving forth of women and children homeless into the veldt, the paying of spies by English gold to tempt men into plots and then shooting them, I would not have believed it. Now it is quite easy to understand. *This is war.* This sordid, mean, wild brute development is war, the thing we hear so often praised and commended and gloried in. I do not think it is fair to blame the English soldiers as something exceptionally brutal and mean. They are not so. It would be the same if any other army was concerned. It is simply *war.*"

Disbelief in Christ's Claims. In a timely article in the *Churchman* for January 26, Mr. George Foster Peabody of Brooklyn argues that nothing, not even lust itself, is more subversive of Christian truth and character than the upholding of war, in general and in particular, by ministers of Christ. We quote a few strong paragraphs:

"It is utterly beyond my comprehension to understand how the mind claiming to believe in the Christ as made known in the Gospels can for a single moment justify the act of gathering together men in armies with the one sole object of producing results by the actual or threatened killing of their fellow-men. Is not this an evil way? How can this first premise be denied? The argument from it must be in favor of 'doing evil that good may follow.'"

"It is possible to understand in some manner the present carnival of vice in New York, for the temptation to personal indulgence is ever present, with a power only to be resisted through the aid of the infinitely righteous One; but it is not possible for many to comprehend the

approval by men of righteous desire of the separation, which army life means, of masses of men from all family association, for it is beyond question that the absence of women, who are held in reverence through family association, is sure to be accompanied by the persistent tendency to bestial sexual indulgence.

"Alas! the records of our own armies too recently prove this. I ask that those of our fold who approve war procure authentic records of the camps established in Pennsylvania, Kentucky and elsewhere during the recent war against Spain, before our troops left for the tropical climate. What a record has been thus made for the civilization so boasted of! Alas! This boasting is a danger which in itself should warn the teachers of the doctrines of the lowly Nazarene.

"I cannot but believe that a lapse from personal purity upon the part of the preachers of Christ's doctrines would be far less harmful to their efforts for his cause than this approval of war as a substitute for moral force, for a great personal temptation might override their intellect and conscience for a time; but the intellectual assertion that physical force is the only final arbiter, in certain cases which are to be decided as impossible of moral solution by the finite human being, is, it seems to me, a complete demonstration of their disbelief in the claim of Christ to be the Prince of Peace."

Submerging the Boys. The way in which the war in South Africa has affected boys in some of the English schools is most distressing. A teacher in one of the seaport towns declared some time ago, when the war was at its height, that the instruction given from the time of the outbreak of hostilities was wasted. The boys' minds were so preoccupied with the events of the war that nothing else could be gotten into them. When news of a British victory or the relief of a garrison came, out rushed the boys to the playground and made "a mighty roar of greeting" as the Union Jack was run up to the top of the flagstaff. They adorned themselves with photo buttons of the generals at the front, and marched through the streets adding their shouts to the general din. Back in school, they waited for another telegram to repeat the youthful storm. They could write essays only on soldiers; read only history of fights; take interest only in the geography of South Africa. At the Public Library the books which the schoolboys took out were tales of soldier lads, stories of bold pirates, and lives of "great British generals." The brute, the teacher went on to say, had gotten the mastery, and the boy was submerged. It takes only a slight knowledge of human nature and the philosophy of men's lives to see what the outcome will be thirty years hence of this brutalization of the boys of England. More of brutality and savagery can be stirred into life in a young boy in twelve months than can be gotten out of him afterwards in twice as many years. It is this polluting of the national life at its very roots, perhaps more than anything else, which at the present moment makes

the future of Great Britain look so dark and uncertain. But our own American house has just now at least one side made of glass, and we must not throw too many stones.

Century of Humanity. In a recent newspaper article Mr. Hall Caine makes some strong utterances about the moral achievements which he expects to be made in the twentieth century :

"I believe that the century of humanity will witness a great progress in the attitude of the people toward international affairs. Education and travel, the great and only true socialists, breaking down the barriers of language and of the prejudices which result therefrom, will make war in the twentieth century a rarer thing than it has been in the past, until finally it will be seen that as a means of settling international disputes it is barbarous, brutal and impossible.

"I think the century of humanity will recognize the principle that all forms of violence are wrong and useless; that the morality of a nation ought not to be lower than the morality of the individual; that it is a false and un-Christian theory which teaches that the laws which apply to man in his individual character do not apply to him in his national character, and that it is wrong to commit murder in whatever form, under whatever authority, not merely because a holy book says 'Thou shalt not kill,' but because to kill is to outrage a law.

"I think the century of humanity will recognize the fact that, while the people individually have been for nineteen hundred years converted to Christianity, the people as nations have during all that time been for the most part utterly pagan.

"And all this, I think, will come to pass not merely or mainly by the development of the higher intelligence of humanity, nor yet by the eternal religion in the human soul, but mainly by the operation of purely natural law. This natural law will make warfare, especially aggressive warfare, an insane and impossible thing; it will make an armed peace a ruinous and ridiculous form of war in disguise; and it will prove to the utmost the everlasting truth, as applied to nations and empires, that they that take the sword will perish by the sword.

"Finally, and above all, I think the century of humanity will see, as no century has yet seen, that our race prejudices are confessions of our ignorance of life and of the narrowness of our human sympathies. It will prove that it is foolish and uncivilized for an Englishman to hate or distrust a Frenchman as such, and for a Frenchman to hate and distrust an Englishman as such, and to suppose that the interest of the one must be watched and protected against the interest of the other.

"The century of humanity will not hesitate to say that humanity is one with the same interests, the same aims, the same passions, the same impulses, with love and pity and fatherhood and motherhood, the same in all races; that a good man is a good man and a bad man a bad man, whatever his name or nationality or creed or color; and that the world must sooner or later come to recognize the sublime truth of that first and grandest of the principles of Christ which teaches the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

The report of the Congressional Committee on the West Point hazing has brought to light more of the "civilized" character of modern war and the institutions which train men for leaders in it. The report awakened a good deal of wrath among members of Congress. The blot thrown on "the fair and glorious fame" of the academy was too much for them. But why did they not find out earlier the kind of heathenism and vulgarity which lived and flourished in the institution? It had been known to outsiders for many years. Not only had hazing of the cruelest kind prevailed, but the fourth-class men were habitually subjected to a kind of treatment amounting practically to abject slavery. How any self-respecting young man submitted to it, is more than we can fathom; how any parent could have deliberately sent his boy into it, is a still darker mystery. We have heard from eye-witnesses stories that made our blood run hot, of how even subordinate officers in the institution sometimes treated newcomers with a shamelessness and vileness of speech that made it impossible to rank these particular officials anywhere but among human brutes. But why should one wonder at what the Congressional Committee has discovered? The purpose for which the institution exists explains very largely the cruelty, the tyranny and the vulgarity prevailing in it. Congress proposes to abolish both the hazing and the fighting. It may succeed in doing so, though we have no large faith that it can be done. Even if the effort succeeds, something else will be invented by the cadets to take the place of what has been abolished. It is impossible to secure in young men training for the art of human slaughter that kind of moral interest in their fellows which will keep low and inhuman practices down. Even the committee is not willing to trust the pledge of the cadets that they will abolish hazing. A threat of degradation is to be held constantly over their heads, and they are to be put, grown young men though they are, night and day under the oversight of officers, for "the presence of army officers in the camp at all hours of the day and night is absolutely essential to the maintenance of discipline." This is not so of any other kind of institution in which young men are educated. Training in the art of killing necessarily creates in some degree lawlessness and disregard for others.

The demonstration made by a number of the peace societies of Europe on the 22d of February for several years past was continued this year. The resolution passed at the various demonstrations was substantially as follows :

"At the present time, when the nations of the earth are competing with one another in the production of the most deadly instruments of warfare, it becomes the imperative duty of those who represent and advocate the

peaceful solution of international disputes to raise their voices in defense of the principles they hold.

"The outbreak of sanguinary wars so soon after the Hague Conference has been adduced by many as a proof of the futility of the work undertaken on that occasion. The friends of Peace assembled at . . . on the 22d of February, 1901, unhesitatingly assert that such wars, on the contrary, prove the urgent necessity of holding further international meetings, and of making renewed efforts for the establishment of law and order between nations.

"They pledge themselves, therefore, to labor unremittingly for the realization of the great principles proclaimed by the delegates convened to attend the first sittings of the 'Parliament of Man.' And they warmly welcome the efforts to establish a permanent tribunal of arbitration, shortly to be inaugurated at The Hague, holding as they do that the peaceful and juridical settlement of international differences henceforth becomes a duty which, on no defensible grounds, can be disregarded by any government or nation claiming to form an integral part of the civilized world."

MacArthur's Denial.

During the discussion in the Senate of the canteen, now fortunately abolished, several senators depicted in strong language the enormities of drunkenness and licentiousness in Manila, for the existence of which the evidence has been overwhelming. To meet these serious charges General Corbin cabled to General MacArthur for a statement as to conditions at Manila, asking the pointed question whether houses of prostitution were licensed, protected or in any way encouraged by the military authorities. In reply General MacArthur cabled that drunkenness was no more noticeable than in garrisons in the United States, and, considering the whole force, probably less so. He denied that houses of prostitution were licensed, protected or encouraged. In reply to this denial the *New Voice*, whose agent was long in Manila, and now supports many of his charges by Surgeon-General Sternberg's annual report, says:

"The evidence in the case is fortunately altogether too clear to require any considerable discussion. Whether the army in Manila behaves itself better or worse than at home is a matter of no particular importance. The fact, however, that the canteen, the saloon, and the house of infamy, established and fostered by the military government in Manila, do lead our young soldier boys to the most foul and outrageous excesses, is beyond all dispute. We need make no reference to Mr. Johnson's observations there. We need not cite the confirmatory testimony of scores of other competent observers. We need not refer to the oft-quoted columns of the leading administration journal of the city — *Freedom*. All these things are clear in the public mind, and we only add a reference to an official document with which General MacArthur ought at least to be acquainted:

"The report of the judge-advocate of the army in the Philippines for the first ten and one-half months of American occupation, shows that out of an army of 21,000 men there were

422 trials for drunkenness on duty, while for the 'violation of the sixty-second article of war'—by far the greater part of which cases are always for drunkenness or for offenses growing out of drunkenness—there were 6,442 trials."

"General MacArthur's closing sentence must have been written 'with a mental reservation,' for contradicting facts are proved by indisputable testimony. The military government of the city of Manila has established a system of inspection, supervision and practical license of the houses of prostitution. The 'department of inspection' is officially recognized and reports in the official reports of the army. One of the books of certificates which it furnishes to the abandoned women of the city of Manila is now in the office of *The New Voice*, and facsimile pages from it have been reproduced in these columns. Keepers of houses of prostitution in the city of Manila are not allowed to conduct their business unless they first take out a special license for the sale of beer, and photographs of these houses, flaunting their beer signs on the front, are in the possession of *The New Voice*, and have been copied in this paper. Further than that, it is a well-known fact that under the military government in force in Manila, it would be possible for the commanding general to close every house of infamy in the city, and deport every abandoned woman if he chose. Instead of that the city swarms with immoral resorts.

"General MacArthur's general denial proves nothing, except what has already been proved, that the War Department is willing to resort to mendacity and semi-mendacity, to prevent the American public learning the infamies for which it is responsible in the Philippine Islands."

The Peace Society of London, through its president, Sir Joseph Pease, M. P., has sent the following address to the new king of England:

"TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

"SIRE,—On behalf of the Peace Society, the oldest existing organization having for its object the promotion of International Peace and Arbitration, we desire most respectfully to express to your Majesty our deep sympathy with yourself, Her Majesty the Queen, and all the members of the Royal family, in the great loss which you have sustained, in common with the empire and the whole world, through the death of your august mother, our late beloved and lamented Queen.

"We are thankful to Almighty God, the King of kings, for the great and rich record of her illustrious reign; and for the true nobility of her character, which was manifested alike in all the circumstances and events of her life. She has left a glorious memory, which fully merits the tribute paid in your own well-chosen words, that she 'united the virtues of supreme domestic goodness with the affection and patriotism of a wise and peace-loving monarch.'

"Not the least striking feature of the period just closed is the remarkable development—with which our own country has always been most closely identified—of the ideas and methods of International Peace, culminating in the recent Conference at The Hague, which not only formed its crowning achievement, but also its truest preparation for a better and more prosperous, because peaceful, future. That the beginning of Your Majesty's reign

should coincide with the new era which is introduced by the establishment of a permanent tribunal of arbitration, we consider to be a good augury, for its creation means the introduction of justice as a controlling factor in international affairs: it is righteousness, whose work is peace, which alone exalteth a nation; and it is in righteousness that the throne shall be established.

"Your Majesty's life, spent in our midst, and the encouragement which you have always given to the peaceful arts and pursuits of your people, have already testified to your own share of that affection and patriotism which mark the wise and peace-loving monarch. We are therefore assured that in the new circumstances of your exalted position you will not fail to win, as sovereign, the whole-hearted devotion of your subjects; and that you will continue to maintain their best interests — the greatest of which has been declared and is admitted to be peace."

Negotiation in Labor Troubles.

Mr. John R. Commons writes as follows in the current number of the *American Monthly Review of Reviews*:

"Philanthropists have long been dreaming of the time when capital and labor should lay aside the strike and boycott and should resort to arbitration. By arbitration they understand the submission of differences to a disinterested third party. But the philanthropists have overlooked a point. Arbitration is never accepted until each party to a dispute is equally afraid of the other; and when they have reached that point, they can adopt something better than arbitration — namely, negotiation. This distinction was clearly brought out at the notable conference on arbitration held at Chicago in December, 1900, under the auspices of the National Civic Federation. All the speakers were men of practical experience, and they agreed that arbitration is impossible without organization, and that two equally powerful organizations can negotiate as well as arbitrate. This higher form of industrial peace — negotiation — has now reached a formal stage in a half-dozen large industries in the United States, which, owing to its remarkable likeness to parliamentary government in the country of its origin, England, may well be called constitutional government in industry.

"The longshoremen and the dock managers of the Great Lakes now meet twice a year in a grand parliament of two houses, — the House of Lords and the House of Commons. The House of Lords is a primary assembly of all the dock managers along the lakes, each firm or corporation appearing, in its primary right of ownership. The House of Commons is a representative assembly of two delegates from each local union of longshoremen. The dock managers, to the number of twenty or thirty, meet in their house on one side of the street; the longshoremen, to the number of sixty or more, meet in another house on the other side. Each house appoints a conference committee of four or five members, including its president and secretary. These committees receive proper instructions from their constituent bodies. They meet in joint sessions, where they present their demands and counterdemands. These are referred back to the respective houses for discussion and further instructions.

In this way, for ten or fifteen days, they higggle and bluff and parry until they can agree on a scale of wages and conditions of labor for every port and every kind of traffic under their joint jurisdiction. There is no arbitration; nothing is submitted to a disinterested third party. Each house has a veto on the other. The legislation adopted must be such that each independently consents to it; not that each is fully satisfied with it, but that each is convinced that nothing better can be secured without civil war, that is, a strike or lockout. In this way, some twenty dock companies and thirty-five thousand dock laborers have created the highest form of industrial peace, namely, constitutional government."

Irritating the Cubans.

The course pursued at Washington in regard to the relations to be sustained by the New Cuban republic to the United States seems to us most unfortunate. The demands formulated by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and passed by Congress have wounded the inhabitants of the island sorely. We do not wonder at it. The Cubans have been assured, often in the most solemn ways, that they were to have a free and independent government. Now at the last moment, when their constitution is ready to go into effect, they are told that it will not be approved and that the United States power will not be withdrawn from the island until they accept such conditions as are entirely incompatible with independence. It is a slap in the face of Cuba unworthy of our government. It is still worse; it is an act of essential unfaithfulness to promises. The Cubans show themselves disposed to stand upon their clear rights. They have drawn up a statement of what they are willing to concede, which does not meet some of the Washington demands. What the outcome will be it is not easy to conjecture. It will be a piece of extreme good fortune if the episode ends without a serious clash. The proper thing to have done was very simple. The Cuban Constitutional Convention ought to have been allowed to complete its constitution without the question of relations to this country being raised. When the new government went into effect would have been the time to raise and settle this question. There is no reason to doubt that the new government would have gladly made a treaty with our country conceding everything that could be fairly asked. The Cubans have not been ungrateful, and suddenly they have been told that they are not to be trusted, and that they are weak and incapable. Their new republic must begin with a halter around the neck of its independence. This is an injury to their sensibilities which was wholly uncalled for. They will not soon forget it. If the Washington programme is carried out, the result will be a lasting soreness towards the United States, for which we shall have only ourselves to blame.

Philippine Government.

Congress has placed for the present all power in the Philippines, civil as well as military, in the hands of the President. The proposition to do this was vigorously condemned by Senator Hoar and others as another step in a course which ought at once to be arrested, as imposing upon the Filipinos a despotism of a most unchecked kind, and as wiping out the last hope that the United States is to continue to be the inspiration of down-trodden peoples. Here is the full text of the enactment by which for the time being Congress has turned over into the hands of *one man* all the powers which it has in relation to ten millions of people:

"All military, civil and judicial powers necessary to govern the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaties concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898, and at Washington on the 7th day of November, 1900, shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct, for the establishment of civil government and for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property and religion.

"Provided, that all franchises granted under the authority hereof shall contain a reservation of the right to alter, amend or repeal the same. Until a permanent government shall have been established in said archipelago, full reports shall be made to Congress, on or before the first day of each regular session, of all legislative acts and proceedings of the temporary government instituted under the provisions hereof; and full reports of the acts, doings of said government and as to the condition of the archipelago and its people, shall be made to the President, including all information which may be useful to the Congress in providing a more permanent government.

"Provided, that no sale or lease or other disposition of the public lands or the timber thereon, or the mining rights therein shall be made; and provided further, that no franchise shall be granted which is not approved by the President of the United States and is not in his judgment clearly necessary for the immediate government of the islands and indispensable for the interest of the people thereof, and which cannot without great public mischief be postponed until the establishment of permanent civil government; and all such franchises shall terminate one year after the establishment of such permanent civil government."

Brevities.

... Mr. Choate, United States ambassador to Great Britain, at the suggestion of China, has been chosen arbitrator between the British and Chinese governments in the case of the British ship *Kow-Ching*, which was chartered to carry Chinese troops at the opening of the China-Japan war, and was sunk by a Japanese warship before hostilities had been declared.

... The Swiss peace societies, in an admiring and sympathetic address to the peace societies of Great Britain on the war in South Africa, say that "the confidence

which Liberal England inspired in the world at large has been shaken to its roots."

... The new French submarine boat *Morse*, at the recent trial at Cherbourg, descended to a depth of eighteen feet and stayed under the water sixteen hours, without fatigue to the lungs of the crew. By an ingenious instrument, the periscope, floating invisibly on the surface, everything above was visible. Query: Will future wars be fought in the air or below the surface of the sea?

... "The moral world surely would be strangely ordered if a nation could be cured of its own vices by making an attack on another nation. Could a man cure himself of his personal or domestic vices by an onslaught on a man in the street?"—*Goldwin Smith*.

... Speaking of the Simultaneous Mission in Great Britain, the *Arbitrator* says that, while some brave and true men like Dr. Clifford and Rev. F. B. Meyer are connected with it, the hands of most of the ministers are too full of blood to make them fit for saving souls. "We declare unhesitatingly that the Price Hughes's, Dawsons, Snells, Watsons and Greenoughs have alienated more good men and women in fifteen months than they are likely to win in fifteen years."

... The *Philadelphia Times* says that "the friendly intercourse which our merchants have been trying to cultivate with the South American republics is neutralized by the McKinley policy 'of expansion.'"

... Speaking in the Canadian House of Commons on the 11th of February, Sir Wilfred Laurier said that the matter of the joint high commission for the settlement of the Alaskan boundary was just as when the commission last separated. He did not doubt that the subject would be taken up after the close of the session and of the United States Congress, and a satisfactory conclusion reached, at least by an honorable compromise.

... The National Women's Christian Temperance Union has, through its officials, connected itself with the Women's Universal Peace Alliance whose headquarters are at Paris.

... The General Peace Association of the Netherlands has just issued its twenty-eighth Year-book. It covers more than one hundred pages, and contains the report of the annual meeting of the Association, an account of the events of the year 1900, a report of the Paris Peace Congress, of the Interparliamentary Conference, and much other interesting information.

... In his address at the meetings at Portland, Me., to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Christian Endeavor Society, Dr. John Henry Barrows, president of Oberlin College, declared that the chief causes of the uprising in China against foreigners were not the missionaries or their teachings, but the cruel selfishness, the deliberate and despotic robbery, and the diabolic greed of which the so-called Christian powers have been guilty.

... In the *Outlook* for February 9 is an extremely able article by Prof. Jean C. Bracq of Vassar College, which every one ought to read who wishes to have a fair and comprehensive notion of the French side of the present relations between France and England.